SUBJECT No. 6.

Appointment of Village Munsiffs.

Messrs. Chikkabadappa, and Agali Venkataramaiya, Sira taluk, Chik Subba Rao, Hunsur taluk, Madappa, Mysore taluk, Chikka Guruva Reddy and Veerappa Reddy, Bangalore taluk, Puttappa, Bangalore District Board, Dhalappa and T. Ramaswami Iyengar, Anekal taluk, and Naraharaiya, Nelamangala taluk.

Withdrawn.

SUBJECT No. 7.

Amendment of Section II of the Mysore Civil Courts Regulation.

Mr. H. Narasinga Rao, Bar Association, Mysore.

Summary of discussion.—At present, the jurisdiction of Munsiffs extends up to Rs. 2,500 in all cases except where the subject matter is land paying revenue to Government, in which case five times the assessment determines the jurisdiction of the Civil Courts. This is an anamolous procedure. For, in cases of suits for the recovery of land, the Munsiff has jurisdiction to try the suit provided five times the annual assessment of the land does not exceed Rs. 2,500 even though the market value of the land be Rs. 50,000. But in suits for the recovery of a house or garden, money or other movable property, the Munsiff cannot try the suit, if the market value of the subject matter exceeds Rs. 2,500. Section II of the Civil Courts Regulation may therefore be amended so as to make the market value of the land as determining the jurisdiction.

Mr. H. Narasinga Rao pointed out that while in the case of houses, it is their market value that is taken into consideration, the assessment is taken as the criterion in the case of lands. He agreed that his suggestion, if adopted, would lead to more court fees being paid by parties in land suits but argued that there should be a separate criterion for purposes of jurisdiction as distinguished from court fees.

Reply of Government.—Will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 8.

Introduction of certain Acts into Mysore.

(1) Mr. H. K. Veerabasaviah, Lingayet Education Fund Association, Bangalore.
(1–4) Messrs. M. C. Rangiengar, Mysore City Municipal Council, C. Krishnamurti, Bangalore Law Association and H. Narasinga Rao, Bar Association, Mysore.

Summary of discussion.—The introduction into Mysore of (1) the Negotiable Instruments Act; (2) the Easement Act; (3) the Suits Valuation Act; and (4) the Transfer of Property Act with the necessary modifications.

Mr. C. Krishnamurti pointed out the variety of practice that had arisen regarding mortgages, owing to the Transfer of Property Act not being in force. He suggested that the first 53 sections of the Transfer of Property Act might be simplified and that the other portions of the Act, such as the provisions *re* sale, lease, mortgage, etc., might be introduced with advantage.

Messrs. C. Krishna Murti and H. K. Veerabasaviah, also urged the necessity for the introduction of the Negotiable Instruments Act in view of the large mercantile transactions in the State.

Reply of Government.—Will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 9.

Gambling Act to be extended to all taluks.

Mr. Bore Gowda, Yedatore taluk.

Summary of discussion.—The Gambling Act has been passed but it has not been extended to the taluks. It is therefore prayed that the Act may be extended to all the villages and towns in the State as it is only then that gambling can be put down. Further, offences under this Act may be made cognizable by the Police and then alone good results can be expected.

Reply of Government.—Instructions will be issued to enforce the provisions relating to the prevention of gambling in the Police Regulation.

SUBJECT No. 10.

Introduction of a law for the proper management and upkeep of Muzrai institutions in the State.

Messrs. B. Alasingra Char and Dodda Payanna, Hassan taluk.

Summary of discussion.—All over the State there are numerous temples endowed with inam lands. Many of the temples are in need of repairs; and in some there is no worship. With a view to manage and maintain such temples properly a law may be introduced.

Reply of Government.—The Muzrai Regulation has been passed into law.

SUBJECT No. 11.

The Muzrai Bill.

Mr. S. R. Balakrishna Rao, Shimoga municipality.

Withdrawn.

SUBJECT No. 12.

Infant Marriages Prevention Regulation.

(*a*) Mr. Amble Anniah Pandit, Mysore City Municipal Council.
(*a*) & (*b*) Mr. C. Krishnamurti, Law Association, Bangalore.

Summary of discussion.—Modification of the Infant Marriages Prevention Regulation, X of 1894, as follows, is desirable :—

(*a*) Raising the marriageable age of girls from 8 to 10.

(*b*) Fixing the minimum marriageable age of boys at 18.

Mr. C. Krishnamurti.—The minimum for girls should be increased to 10. In the Census Report it is stated that the number of married girls between the ages of 5 and 10 is about 3,000 of whom 55 are widows. He anticipated objections regarding his proposal from the orthodox party but would recommend it for the benefit of the public.

Messrs. Venkataramiah and Subba Setti argued *contra* and stated that Government should not interfere in such matters. The present law was passed after careful consideration, and it was quite enough for the present.